IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMES M. MALARIK,)	
)	Civil Action No. 07 - 1501
Plaintiff,)	
)	Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan
v.)	
)	
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA-)	
OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF BEAVER)	
COUNTY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

The above captioned case was initiated by the filing of a Motion to Proceed *In Forma*Pauperis (doc. no. 1) on November 6, 2007, and was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Lisa

Pupo Lenihan for pretrial proceedings in accordance with the Magistrate Judges Act, 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1), and Rules 72.1.3 and 72.1.4 of the Local Rules for Magistrate Judges.

Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan filed a Report and Recommendation on January 16, 2008 (doc. no. 9) recommending that the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice in accordance with the directives of the Prison Litigation Reform Act under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff filed Objections to the Report and Recommendation on January 30, 2008 (doc. no. 10). Plaintiff's Objections do not undermine the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

In this regard, a complaint must be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(6) if it does not allege "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v.Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1974 (May 21, 2007) (rejecting the traditional 12 (b)(6) standard set forth in Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)). The court must accept as true all allegations of the Complaint and all reasonable factual inferences must be viewed in the light most

favorable to plaintiff. Angelastro v. Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc., 764 F.2d 939, 944 (3d Cir. 1985). The Court, however, need not accept inferences drawn by plaintiff if they are unsupported by the facts as set forth in the complaint. *See* California Pub. Employee Ret. Sys. v. The Chubb Corp., 394 F.3d 126, 143 (3d Cir. 2004) (citing Morse v. Lower Merion School Dist., 132 F.3d 902, 906 (3d Cir. 1997)). Nor must the court accept legal conclusions set forth as factual allegations. Bell Atlantic Corp., 127 S. Ct. at 1965 (citing Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)). "Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Bell Atlantic Corp., 127 S.Ct. at 1965. Although the United States Supreme Court does "not require heightened fact pleading of specifics, [the Court does require] enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Id.* at 1974.

Here, Plaintiff's Complaint does set forth any facts upon which to support a claim for malicious, vindictive or selective prosecution against the County. *Accord* Waite v. Beaver County, 2007 WL 878525, *1 (W.D.Pa. March 21, 2007). Consequently, after *de novo* review of the pleadings and documents in the case, together with the Report and Recommendation, and the Objections thereto, the following order is entered:

AND NOW, this 17 day of March, 2008;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that that the Complaint is DISMISSED with prejudice in accordance with the directives of the Prison Litigation Reform Act under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (doc. no. 9) of Magistrate Judge Lenihan dated January 16, 2008, is adopted as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court mark this case CLOSED.

AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 4(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Plaintiff has thirty (30) days to file a notice of appeal as provided by Rule 3 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

By the Court:

Donetta W. Ambrose

United States District Judge, Chief

cc: Lisa Pupo Lenihan

United States Magistrate Judge

James M. Malarik, No. 130218 Allegheny County Jail 950 Second Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3100

James M. Malarik P.O. Box 572

Ambridge, PA 15003